



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/532,360	04/20/2005	Pieter Jan Bolt	310.1047	1574
20311 7590 06/26/2007 LUCAS & MERCANTI, LLP 475 PARK AVENUE SOUTH 15TH FLOOR NEW YORK, NY 10016			EXAMINER WOLFE, DEBRA M	
			ART UNIT 3725	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/26/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

H

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/532,360	Applicant(s) BOLT ET AL.	
	Examiner Debra Wolfe	Art Unit 3725	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 April 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 April 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |



DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on April 13, 2007 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

1. Claims 8-13 are again rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kergen for the reasons set forth in paragraph 7 of the Office action mailed May 10, 2006.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.



1. Claims 1-4 and 7 are again rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andersen (US Patent # 4,316,379) in view of Kergen (US Patent # 5,477,723) for the reasons set forth in the Office action mailed May 10, 2006.
2. Claims 5 and 6 are again rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andersen (US Patent # 4,316,379) in view of Kergen (US Patent # 5,477,723) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Cao et al for the reasons set forth in paragraph 5 of the Office action mailed May 10, 2006.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed April 13, 2007 have been carefully considered but are not found to be persuasive. Applicant argues that Kergen performs a trial run for a different purpose compared to the trial run of Applicant's invention. Applicant further argues that Kergen does not teach of providing a relatively small initial force exerted on the downholder at the beginning of deep drawing.

In response to Applicant's arguments the Examiner kindly disagrees with the Applicant. Applicant's attention is directed to column 4 lines 39-41 where Kergen states "the following examples illustrate the application of the system according to the invention to several typical exemplary cases." Applicant cited in col. 3 lines 45-53 and col. 4 lines 44-46 of Kergen as teaching of performing a trial run to help maintain the stamping force at a maximum value so that the punch works with a practically constant force. This is true with respect to that particular example of an exemplary case. However, the Examiner is relying upon the third example [See col. 4 line 61-col. 5 line 9] addressed by Kergen to teach of performing a trial run to obtain a predetermined thickness trend of the blank. Kergen states in this example that a processor



generates the pressure command according to a regulation logic, which is capable of minimizing the blank-holding pressure to the value, which is just necessary to prevent the development of crinkles. The Examiner asserts that this regulation logic is not that same as the regulation logic Applicant has cited in the arguments since the latter regulation logic is used to help maintain a maximum stamping force value and not a minimum blank-holding pressure as stated in col. 5 lines 5-9 of Kergen. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to control the blank holding force of Andersen with the use of contactless sensing of the condition of the separation of the blank holder and die ring as taught by Kergen in order to maximize the reduction ration and prevent the development of crinkles during the deep drawing operation.

With regards to claims 5 and 6 Applicant has not advanced separate arguments regarding these dependent claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Debra Wolfe whose telephone number is (571) 272-1904. The examiner can normally be reached Monday - Thursday 7am - 4:30pm with alternating Friday 7am - 3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Derris Banks can be reached at (571) 272-4419. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.



Application/Control Number: 10/532,360
Art Unit: 3725

Page 5

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Debra Wolfe
Examiner
Art Unit 3725

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Derris H. Banks", is written over a horizontal line.

DERRIS H. BANKS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700